

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 7, 2004, the Examiner objected to the drawings because reference number "72" (located between 78 & 84) in Fig. 6 should be changed to "70" in order to designate the front gripping plate and not the second gripping plate "72", as is correctly performed in Figs. 4 and 5. Fig. 6 has been changed by amendment as required by the Examiner, and reference number "70" now properly designates the front gripping plate. A corrected drawing sheet, including Fig. 5 (unchanged) and corrected Fig. 6, is submitted herewith. Applicant thanks the Examiner for detecting the erroneous reference number.

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application.

Claims 18-21 are allowed.

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated they would be allowable if they were rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims have now been so rewritten so that the limitations of base Claim 1 are now included in each of the previously objected to claims. Specifically, Claims 2, 3, 5, 9 and 14 now each include the limitations of base Claim 1, in addition to the limitations of each of the amended claims. Claim 4 which is dependent from amended Claim 3, Claim 6 which is dependent from amended Claim 5, Claim 7 which is dependent from amended Claim 6, Claims 10 and 11 which are dependent from amended Claim 9, Claim 12 which is dependent from amended Claim 11, and Claim 13 which is dependent from Claim 12 all now include all of the limitations of the original base claim and any intervening claims, are believed to be in condition for allowance, as provisionally indicated by the Examiner.

Claim 22 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 8 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burrows. However, a close examination of Burrows, and a comparison of Burrows to applicant's structure as specified in Claims 1, 8, and 15-17, reveals that Burrows does not

disclose a first fitting for securing the mounting plate to the logistic track in a longitudinal direction or a second fitting for securing said mounting plate to the logistic track in a longitudinal direction, as specified in independent Claims 1 and 16. Close examination of the “first fitting (20) attached to the rear of said mounting plate” and the “second fitting (21) attached to the front of said mounting plate”, as characterized by the Examiner, reveals that studs 20 and 21 of Burrows are and remain free to slide within track 35 at all times unless the plunger 26, which the Examiner equates to the “key” specified by applicant in Claims 1 and 16, is engaged in opening 35a in track 35. In fact, the longitudinally slideable engagement of the studs 20 and 21 in track 35 is critical to the operation of the Burrows wheel chock assembly. This is best shown at Col. 2, lines 45-56 of Burrows wherein it is stated in part

... the studs are installed in a pair of openings 35a and then *laterally slid* under the narrower openings in the track (i.e., under the ledge portions 35b). The plunger which is positioned so that with the studs under the ledge portions fits into a opening 35a is then released so it drops into the opening where it acts to retain the studs in position under the ledge portions. The chock is thus firmly retained in position.... (emphasis added)

Thus, it is the plunger 26, not the studs 20 and 21, secures the base plate 16 of the Burrows wheel chock to the track 35 in a longitudinal direction. Thus, whereas independent Claims 1 and 16 require that the first fitting and the second fitting each secure the mounting plate in a longitudinal direction, the studs 20 and 21 of Burrows which are attached to the rear and front of the Burrows mounting plate, respectively, do not secure the mounting plate to the logistic track in a longitudinal direction, and in fact must be longitudinally slideable within such track in order to be operable. It is further clear that the principle function of the plunger 26 of Burrows is to secure the base longitudinally within the track. When the plunger 26 is disengaged the base and studs 20 and 21 are longitudinally slideable. Accordingly, applicant submits that Burrows does not disclose, teach or suggest the mounting plate assembly specified in independent Claims 1 and 16.


Claims 8 and 15 remain dependent on original Claim 1 of this application and are deemed allowable for the same reason as Claim 1 is believed allowable, and further because of the additional structure which is specified in Claims 8 and 15. Likewise, Claim 17 remains dependent upon original Claim 16 and is deemed allowable for the same reason that Claim 16 is believed allowable, and further because of the additional structure which is specified in Claim 17.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Theodore J. Long, Reg. No. 20648
Attorney for Applicant
Lathrop & Clark
740 Regent Street, Suite 400
P.O. Box 1507
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1507
(608) 257-7766

Amdt1.res/amdt